UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,299	12/03/2003	Brian Jones	60001.286US01	5350

27488 7590 10/31/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
BOTTS, MICHAEL K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/727,299	JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. Botts	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 August 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 18, 2006 has been entered.

2. This is a Non-Final Office Action.

3. Claims 1-21 have been examined, with claims 1, 8 and 15 being the independent claims.

4. The Specification is objected to.

5. Claims 1-21 are rejected.

The Specification

6. Applicant is reminded of the continuing requirement to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification, when appropriate, and the status of all citations of U.S. filed applications in the specification should also be updated, when appropriate.

7. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The term "overlap" is not found in the specification. The

term is used in amendments to claims 1, 3, 8, and 15, as within the context of "tag does not overlap the error." Appropriate correction is required.

8. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The term "single tag," as used in claims 1-3 and 5-7 is not found in the specification within the context of a single tag which comprises the complete marking or tagging of a spelling or grammar error. It is noted that the term "single tag" is used in other claims as one of a pair of tags. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. **Claims 1-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 added the limitation that the "tag does not overlap the error" with the term overlap being the subject matter not described in the specification. The dependent claims inherit and

do not remedy the grounds for rejection. It is recognized that the term "overlap" carries a variety of general meanings. The specification does not disclose any indication of how "overlap" is to be defined in the claims, and no indication is found in the specifications, as originally filed, that would reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art at the time of the invention that the inventor has possession of the invention with a limitation that the "tag does not overlap the error."

10. **Claims 1-3 and 5-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, claim 1 specifies a "single tag" which identifies spelling an grammar errors without being comprised of a pair of first and second markers. The "single tag" limitation is not disclosed in the specification and is new matter to this action.

11. **Claims 1-3 and 5-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, claim 1 specifies a "single tag" which identifies spelling an grammar errors without being comprised of a pair of first and second markers. The

"single tag" limitation is not described in the specification and, therefore, is not enabled to one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

12. In the interest of compact prosecution, the application is further examined against the prior art, as stated below, upon the assumption that the applicants may overcome the above stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. **Claims 1-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 added the limitation that the "tag does not overlap the error" with the term overlap being the subject matter not described in the specification. The dependent claims inherit and do not remedy the grounds for rejection. It is recognized that the term "overlap" carries a variety of general meanings. The specification does not disclose any indication of how "overlap" is to be defined in the claims, and no indication is found in the specifications, as originally filed, that particularly point out and distinctly claim the limitation that the "tag does not overlap the error."

In the interest of compact prosecution, and after review of the specification and claims, the Examiner believes Applicants intended the term "overlap" to mean that that the tags are used in the ordinary and usual markup language manner to indicate XML language "well formed" such that the start or end tags for spelling or grammar do not overlap other markup tags. Such "non-overlapping" was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be part of a check for a "well formed" XML document. See, "Introduction to XML," University of Washington Computing and Communications, copyright 1999, available on the Internet as of June 24, 2001, last downloaded by the Examiner on October 28, 2006, from: http://web.archive.org/web/20010624123830/http://www.washington.edu/computing/training/540/xml_well.html. The term will be read with this meaning for the remainder of this Office Action.

14. In the interest of compact prosecution, the application is further examined against the prior art, as stated below, upon the assumption that the applicants may overcome the above stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

15. **Claims 1-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-7 are directed to a "computer-readable medium" that is directed to signal claims, since the specification, at page 5, lines 10-17, describes that the computer readable media also includes a communication media (i.e., modulated data signal, carrier wave). According to the interim guidelines on patent matter eligibility (see, pages 55-57), signal claims do not fall within any of the four statutory classes of invention of 101.

16. **Claims 15-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 for containing non-statutory subject matter as being directed to a program per se. Although the preamble of claim 15 recites an "apparatus," the body of the claim provides details directed to programs, such as a "markup language file," a "validation engine," and an "application." The "apparatus" claims are interpreted to be software alone based on the specification (see, page 6, lines 1-18, which describes the markup language file 210, validation engine 25, and application (word-processor 120)).

17. In the interest of compact prosecution, the application is further examined against the prior art, as stated below, upon the assumption that the applicants may overcome the above stated rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Priority

18. Priority for the present application remains set as of the filing date of December 3, 2003.

Claim Rejections -- 35 USC 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

19. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLean, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0124115 A1, filed November 13, 2001 and published September 5, 2002) [hereinafter "McLean"].

Regarding **independent claim 1, as amended**, McLean teaches:

A computer-readable medium, comprising:

a first component for interpreting a word-processor document stored as an XML file; and

(See, McLean, figure 34, element 345, teaching a loader sub filter as the first component to interpret a document for a spell checker.

See also, McLean, paragraphs [0212]-[0213], teaching that the invention uses XML language and an XML processor to parse the data for use in the filters.

See also, McLean, paragraph [0171], teaching the formatting filter which outputs the formatted control objects to the spellchecker filter.)

a second component for placing at least one marker within the word-processor document indicating at least one error selected from a grammar error and a spelling error; wherein the marker is a single tag that does not overlap the error and does not overlap other elements within the word-processor document.

(See, McLean, figure 34, element 341, and paragraphs [0172]-[0186], teaching the spellchecking filter as the second component.

See also, McLean, paragraph [0180], teaching indicating a spelling error with non-overlapping markers.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, McLean teaches:

The computer-readable medium of Claim 1, further comprising a third component for placing a proof state within the word-processor document.

(It is noted that the proof state is disclosed as an indication that the document has been checked. See, disclosure, page 9, lines 7-8, stating: "The proof state of the document indicates whether the document has been fully checked for spelling & grammar errors."

See, McLean, paragraph [0181], teaching the saver sub-filter which receives the spellchecker data and saving the file to the file system.

McLean does not expressly teach a "component for the proof state."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the saver sub-filter to indicate that spell checking has been completed.

The suggestion or motivation for this modification is found in McLean where it is taught that only new data is sent to the spell checker, implicitly teaching that the invention can distinguish between data that has been checked and that which has not yet been checked.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3, as amended**, McLean teaches:

> *The computer-readable medium of Claim 1, wherein the second component for placing the at least one marker within the word-processor document further comprises placing a start tag and an end tag within the word-processor document around the error; wherein the start tag does not overlap the error and wherein the end tag does not overlap the error.*

(See, McLean, paragraph [0181], teaching the use of two markers comprising a start and an end tag that do not overlap the error.)

Regarding **independent claim 8**, McLean teaches:

> *A method for indicating errors within a word-processor document, comprising:*
>
> *interpreting a word-processor document stored as an XML file;*

placing a first marker within the word-processor document indicating a start of at least one error selected from a grammar error and a spelling error; wherein the first marker is a single tag that does not overlap the error and does not overlap other elements within the word-processor document; and

placing a second marker within the word-processor document indicating an end of the at least one error selected from the grammar error and the spelling error; wherein the second marker is a single tag that does not overlap the error and does not overlap other elements within the word-processor document.

(Claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, McLean teaches:

The method of Claim 8, further comprising placing a proof state within the word-processor document.

(Claim 9 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 15, as amended**, McLean teaches:

A system for indicating errors within a word-processor document, comprising:

a markup language file output by a word processor that includes a first marker and a second marker indicating a start and an end of at least one error

selected from a grammar error and a spelling error; wherein the first marker is a single tag that does not overlap the error and does not overlap other elements within the markup language file and wherein the second marker is a single tag that does not overlap the error and does not overlap other elements within the markup language file; and

a validation engine configured to validate the markup language file; and

an application configured to read a markup language file created in accordance with a schema.

(Claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.
It is noted that a validating a markup language, in particular XML, with a schema is a standard inherent function for processing a markup language file. See, Castro, E., "XML for the World Wide Web, Visual Quickstart Guide," Peachpit Press, 2001, page 245. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to validate a markup language file in accordance with a schema.)

Regarding **dependent claim 16, as currently amended**, McLean teaches:

The system of Claim 15, wherein the ML file is an XML file.

(Claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 15 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. The markup language taught in McLean and Castro is XML.)

Regarding dependent claim 17:

Claim 17 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. **Claims 4, 10, 11, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLean, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0124115 A1, filed November 13, 2001 and published September 5, 2002) [hereinafter "McLean"], and further in view of Ovil, et al, U.S. Patent Publication, 2004/0030540 A1, filed as Provisional application No. 60/401,326 on August 7, 2002) [hereinafter "Ovil"].**

Regarding **dependent claim 4, as amended**, McLean in view of Ovil teaches:

The computer-readable medium of Claim 3, wherein placing the start tag and the end tag within the word-processor document around the error, further comprises placing a grammar start tag before the grammar error and a grammar end tag after the grammar error and a spelling start tag before the spelling error and a spelling end tag after the spelling error.

(McLean teaches the invention of claim 3, but does not expressly teach that the start and end tags are used to identify grammar errors.

Ovil teaches that spell checkers and grammar checkers were known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to involve marking errors, specifically citing Microsoft Word. See, Ovil, paragraphs [0005] and [0014].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of McLean and Ovil.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the references is found in Ovil stating that conventional language processing applications comprise spell checkers and grammar checkers. See, Ovil, paragraph [0003]. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, given the similarity in treatment of spelling and grammar errors taught be Ovil and given that they were both common functions, to also include marking grammar errors using markup language tags.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of McLean and Ovil to result in the invention specified in claim 4.

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, McLean in view of Ovil teaches:

> *The method of Claim 9, wherein placing the first marker and the second marker within the word-processor document, further comprises placing a grammar start tag and a grammar end tag around any grammar error.*

(Claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, McLean in view of Ovil teaches:

The method of Claim 9, wherein placing the first marker and the second marker within the word-processor document, further comprises placing a spelling start tag and a spelling end tag around any spelling error.

(Claim 11 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 19:

Claims 18 and 19 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 4 and are rejected along the same rationale.

21. **Claims 5-7, 12-14, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLean, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0124115 A1, filed November 13, 2001 and published September 5, 2002) [hereinafter "McLean"].**

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, McLean teaches:

The computer-readable medium of Claim 2, wherein the third component for placing the proof state within the word-processor document, further comprises indicating when the word-processor document is in a clean state.

(McLean teaches the invention of claim 2, but does not expressly teach "indicating when the word-processor document is in a clean state."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a function to indicate to a user whether the document had been spell checked for the obvious and beneficial of letting a user know the status of the document, particularly if it was a new user, or if the document had been save and was being re-opened, in order to avoid rechecking the document unnecessarily.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, McLean teaches:

> *The computer-readable medium of Claim 2, wherein the third component for placing the proof state within the word-processor document, further comprises placing a spelling proof state property.*

(McLean teaches the invention of claim 2, but does not expressly teach "placing a spelling proof state property."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a function to indicate to a user whether the document had been spell checked for the obvious and beneficial of letting a user know the status of the document, particularly if it was a new user, or if the document had been save and was being re-opened, in order to avoid rechecking the document unnecessarily.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, McLean teaches:

> *The computer-readable medium of Claim 2, wherein the third component for placing the proof state within the word-processor document, further comprises placing a grammar proof state property.*

(McLean teaches the invention of claim 2, but does not expressly teach "placing a grammar proof state property."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a function to indicate to a user whether the document had been grammar checked for the obvious and beneficial of letting a user know the status of the document, particularly if it was a new user, or if the document had been save and was being re-opened, in order to avoid rechecking the document unnecessarily.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, McLean teaches:

> *The method of Claim 9, wherein placing the proof state within the word-processor document, further comprises indicating when the word-processor document is in a clean state and a dirty state.*

(Claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 5 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. Just as it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of McLean to include an indication of a clean state for the obvious and beneficial purpose of giving a status indication to avoid unnecessary re-checking, so also would it have been equally obvious and beneficial to present an

indication that the document had not been checked to avoid unintentionally failing to check the document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, McLean teaches:

The method of Claim 12, wherein placing the proof state within the word-processor document, further comprises placing a spelling proof state property.

(Claim 13 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 14**, McLean teaches:

The method of Claim 13, wherein placing the proof state within the word-processor document, further comprises placing a grammar proof state property.

(Claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding dependent claim 20:

Claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 5 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **dependent claim 21**, McLean teaches:

The system of Claim 20, wherein the proof state further comprises a spelling proof state property and a grammar proof state property.

(Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 6 and 7 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed August 18, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections of independent claims 1, 8, and 15:

FIRST: Applicants argue that it is not inherent in a markup language document to place "at least one marker within the word-process document indicating at least one error selected from a grammar error and a spelling error that is stored within an XML file. (See, Remarks, page 6.)

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of McLean, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0124115 A1), as stated in the rejections above.

Second: Applicants argue that the claim limitation that the "tags" do not "do not overlap the elements they relate to" is not obvious in view of the cited references. (See, Remarks, page 7.)

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Mclean, paragraph [0181], teaching non-overlapping tags.

Tags not overlapping was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as part of ensuring that the XML document was "well formed." See, "Introduction to XML," University of Washington Computing and Communications, copyright 1999, available on the Internet as of June 24, 2001, last downloaded by the Examiner on October 28, 2006, from: http://web.archive.org/web/20010624123830/http://www.washington.edu/computing/training/540/xml_well.html. Therefore, not only was placing the tags in a non-overlapping state obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, it was essential to making the XML document "well formed" for processing.

Third: Applicants argue that the references fail to teach or suggest "how and where to place tags within an XML file" to mark an element. (See, Remarks, page 7.)

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Mclean, paragraph [0181], teaching non-overlapping tags placed before and after an element.

It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that XML tags were placed before and after elements. See, Simpson, J., "Just XML," Prentice Hall, Second Edition, 2001, page 31, teaching that tags are placed before and after elements, and are not overlapping.

Additional Prior Art

1. The following prior art is made of record and not relied upon that is considered

pertinent to applicants' disclosure:

Angiulo, et al (U.S. Patent 6,044,387), teaching that it was known to tag misspellings.

Conclusion

Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application are reminded of their obligations pursuant to 37 CRF 1.56. See generally, MPEP 2001 and subsections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

William L. Bashore

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER